

### **Remarks**

Applicant has rewritten the claims of record 8, 9, and 11 as new claims 22-24 and amended claim 14 in order to place this application in full condition for allowance.

#### **The Rejection Of Claim 4 Under § 102**

Claim 4 was rejected under § 102(b), as being anticipated by Cooper. (US PAT: 5,459,524). Claim 4 has been canceled.

#### **The Rejection Of Claim 5 Under § 103**

Claim 5 was rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cooper (US PAT: 5,459,524) in view of Ross (US PAT: 5,546,194). Claim 5 has been canceled.

#### **The Rejection Of Claim 6 Under § 103**

Claim 6 was rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cooper (US PAT: 5,416,510) in view of Amano (US PAT: 4,768,015). Claim 6 has been canceled.

#### **The Rejection Of Claim 7 Under § 102**

Claim 7 was rejected under § 102(b), as being anticipated by Cooper. (US PAT: 5,459,524). Claim 7 has been canceled.

#### **The Objection Of Claim 8 Because of Informalities**

Claim 8 was objected to because the phrase “said composite video line” recited in the claim lacked definite antecedence (the phrase had not been previously recited). Claim 8 has been rewritten as new claim 22 to comply with the requirement of form expressly set forth in the objection.

### **The Rejection Of Claim 8 Under § 112**

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, because “the modulated video signal” does not appear to be an inherent feature of the invention (at the processing stage described, the signal would be in demodulated form). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection on the following grounds. In reference to Fig. 1 of the specification, the specification describes in paragraph [0012] that “[a] composite video signal 10 typically includes a horizontal synchronization (sync) pulse 84, a color burst 82, and a modulated video signal 80.” Claim 8 refers to “the modulated video signal” to indicate that portion of the analog composite video defined as the “modulated video signal 80” in the specification and Fig. 1. Claim 8 has been rewritten as new claim 22, and clear reference has been made to “the horizontal sync pulse and the modulated video signal portions” of a video line to obviate this rejection.

### **The Objection Of Claim 9 Because of Informalities**

Claim 9 was objected to because the phrase “said composite video line” recited in the claim lacked definite antecedence (the phrase had not been previously recited). Claim 9 has been rewritten as new claim 23 to comply with the requirement of form expressly set forth in the objection.

**The Rejection Of Claim 9 Under § 112**

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, because “the modulated video signal” does not appear to be an inherent feature of the invention (at the processing stage described, the signal would be in demodulated form). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection on the following grounds. In reference to Fig. 1 of the specification, the specification describes in paragraph [0012] that “[a] composite video signal 10 typically includes a horizontal synchronization (sync) pulse 84, a color burst 82, and a modulated video signal 80.” Claim 9 refers to “the modulated video signal” to indicate that portion of the analog composite video defined as the “modulated video signal 80” in the specification and Fig. 1. Claim 9 has been rewritten as new claim 23, and clear reference has been made to “the horizontal sync pulse and the modulated video signal portions” of a video line to obviate this rejection.

**The Rejection Of Claim 10 Under § 102**

Claim 10 was rejected under § 102(b), as being anticipated by Cooper. (US PAT: 5,459,524). Claim 10 has been canceled.

**The Objection Of Claim 11 Because of Informalities**

Claim 11 was objected to because the phrase “said composite video line” recited in the claim lacked definite antecedence (the phrase had not been previously recited). Claim 11 has been rewritten as new claim 24 to comply with the requirement of form expressly set forth in the objection.

**The Rejection Of Claim 11 Under § 112**

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, because the feature “said composite video” has ambiguous antecedence (both an analog and a digital composite video line were recited earlier). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection on the following grounds. The feature “said composite video” was used to specify the color sub-carrier frequency of the video signal. The color sub-carrier frequency of the video signal is the same whether the composite video is in analog or digital form. Therefore, the language used in claim 11 is not ambiguous in this context. Nonetheless, Claim 11 has been rewritten as claim 24 to eliminate any ambiguous reference to “composite video” by designating more specifically “a color sub-carrier of said video line” to obviate the rejection.

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, because “the modulated video signal” does not appear to be an inherent feature of the invention (at the processing stage described, the signal would be in demodulated form). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection on the following grounds. In reference to Fig. 1 of the specification, the specification describes in paragraph [0012] that “[a] composite video signal 10 typically includes a horizontal synchronization (sync) pulse 84, a color burst 82, and a modulated video signal 80.” Claim 11 refers to “the modulated video signal” to indicate that portion of the analog composite video defined as the “modulated video signal 80” in the specification and Fig. 1. Claim 11 has been rewritten as new claim 24, and clear reference has been made to “the horizontal sync pulse and the modulated video signal portions” of a video line to obviate this rejection.

**The Rejection Of Claim 12 Under § 102**

Claim 12 was rejected under § 102(b), as being anticipated by Cooper. (US PAT: 5,459,524). Claim 12 has been canceled.

**The Rejection Of Claim 13 Under 37 CFR 1.75(c)**

Claim 13 was rejected under § 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim must be in the alternative only. Claim 13 has been canceled.

**The Objection Of Claim 14 Because of Informalities**

Claim 14 was objected to because the word “components” in line 9 should be singular. Claim 14 has been amended to comply with the requirement of form expressly set forth in the objection.


Applicant thus submits that the above new claims obviate all outstanding rejections and will place this application now in full condition for allowance, which action applicant respectfully solicits.

## Conclusion

### Conditional Request For Constructive Assistance

The undersigned, a pro se applicant, has made a diligent effort to amend the claims of this application so that they all are in proper form and define novel structure that is also unobvious. If, for any reason the Examiner believes claims of this application are not in full condition for allowance, applicant respectfully requests the constructive assistance and suggestions of the Examiner pursuant to the spirit of MPEP § 2173.02 and § 707.07(j). This will enable the undersigned to place this application in allowable condition as soon as possible and without the need for further proceedings. The Examiner is authorized to make any minor changes.

Very respectfully,



Frank Sacca, Applicant Pro Se


23036 Rio Lobos Road

Diamond Bar, California 91765

Phone: (909) 396-9282 – Fax (714) 680-0545

**Certificate Of Mailing:** I certify that on the date below I will deposit this document with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: "Box AF, COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS, WASHINGTON, DC 20231.

Date: 2005 August 22



Frank Sacca, Inventor